

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
8 AT TACOMA

9 KATHERINE KING, Personal  
10 Representative of the Estate of LMK, a  
11 minor,

11 Plaintiff,

12 KENNETH KING,

13 Plaintiff-Intervenor,

14 v.

15 THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
16 et al.,

17 Defendants.

CASE NO. C11-5355BHS

ORDER GRANTING  
DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO  
DISMISS

18 This matter comes before the Court on Defendant United States of America's  
19 ("Government") motion to dismiss Kenneth King's ("Mr. King") complaint (Dkt. 40).  
20 The Court has reviewed the briefs filed in support of and in opposition to the motion and  
21 the remainder of the file and hereby grants the motion for the reasons stated herein.

22 **I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

23 **A. Instant Suit**

24 On May 6, 2011, Katherine King ("Ms. King"), as the personal representative of  
25 the estate of LMK, filed a complaint against the Government and Doyon Security  
26 Services, LLC ("Doyon"). Dkt. 1. The complaint alleges that the Government and  
27  
28

1 Doyon allowed a private in the Army to bring LMK onto Fort Lewis Military Base in  
2 violation of certain base policies. *Id.* LMK subsequently passed away in the barracks on  
3 the base. *Id.* Ms. King alleges causes of action on behalf of the estate of LMK as a result  
4 of Defendants' negligent acts. *Id.*

5 On November 9, 2011, Ms. King sent Mr. King, LMK's father, a notice of lawsuit  
6 pursuant to RCW 4.24.010. Dkt. 28, Declaration of Kenneth King, Exh. A. Although  
7 Ms. King has not explicitly asserted a cause of action in her individual capacity under  
8 RCW 4.24.010, she informed Mr. King that he "must join" in the lawsuit or else his rights  
9 to recover under RCW 4.24.010 will be barred. *Id.*

10 On November 15, 2011, Mr. King filed a motion to intervene to protect his right in  
11 the wrongful death action. Dkt. 26. On December 13, 2011, the Court granted Mr. King  
12 permissive intervention. Dkt. 35.

13 On January 12, 2012, the Government filed a motion to dismiss Mr. King's  
14 complaint. Dkt. 40. On February 6, 2012, Mr. King responded. Dkt. 41. On February  
15 10, 2012, the Government responded. Dkt. 45.

## 16 **B. Other Filings**

17 On February 15, 2009, LMK passed away. On August 5, 2009, Ms. King opened a  
18 probate proceeding in Pierce County Superior Court and was appointed Administratrix of  
19 LMK's estate. Dkt. 42, Declaration of Michael David Meyers ("Meyers Decl."), Exhs.  
20 3-5. On the probate petition, Ms. King disclosed two surviving heirs of LMK: Ms. King  
21 as mother and Paul Laughline as father. *Id.*

22 On September 11, 2009, Ms. King filed an administrative claim with the Army  
23 regarding LMK's death. Dkt. 40-1 at 3-5. The claimant is listed as "The Estate of  
24 [LMK] by and through Katherine King as Personal Representative." *Id.*

1 On November 9, 2011, Ms. King filed a new probate petition listing Mr. King and  
2 Ms. King as mother and father. Meyers Decl., Exh. 7. On November 15, 2011, Mr.  
3 King's attorneys filed a notice of appearance in the probate action. *Id.*, Exh. 9.

## 4 II. DISCUSSION

5 A motion to dismiss under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1) addresses the court's subject  
6 matter jurisdiction. "A federal court is presumed to lack jurisdiction in a particular case  
7 unless the contrary affirmatively appears." *Stock West, Inc. v. Confederated Tribes*, 873  
8 F.2d 1221, 1225 (9th Cir. 1989). A plaintiff bears the burden to establish that subject  
9 matter jurisdiction is proper. *Prescott v. United States*, 973 F.2d 696, 701 (9th Cir. 1992).

10 The Federal Tort Claims Act ("FTCA") requires disposition of a claim by a federal  
11 agency as a prerequisite to the initiation of a suit. The relevant statute provides as  
12 follows:

13  
14 An action shall not be instituted upon a claim against the United States for  
15 money damages for injury or loss of property or personal injury or death  
16 caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of any employee of the  
17 Government while acting within the scope of his office or employment,  
unless the claimant shall have first presented the claim to the appropriate  
Federal agency and his claim shall have been finally denied by the agency  
in writing and sent by certified or registered mail.

18 28 U.S.C. § 2675(a). "[T]he administrative claim requirements of Section 2675(a) are  
19 jurisdictional in nature, and thus must be strictly adhered to." *Jerves v. United States*, 966  
20 F.2d 517, 521 (9th Cir. 1992). When no administrative claim has been filed with the  
21 appropriate administrative agency, a district court is without jurisdiction to hear the case,  
22 and dismissal for lack of subject matter jurisdiction is mandated. *Johnson v. United*  
23 *States*, 704 F.2d 1431, 1442 (9th Cir. 1983) (court lacked jurisdiction over wife's loss of  
24 consortium claim due to wife's failure to mention claim for loss of consortium or sign  
25 administrative form.).

26 In this case, the only claimant to file an administrative claim was Ms. King as the  
27 personal representative of LMK's estate. *See* Dkt. 40-1 at 3-5. Strict adherence to the  
28

1 FTCA requires the Court to dismiss any other claimant for lack of subject matter  
2 jurisdiction. Mr. King, however, argues that there exist four reasons why his failure to  
3 file an administrative claim should not preclude his claims against the Government. Dkt.  
4 41 at 13. All of his arguments are without merit.

5 Mr. King's first and fourth reasons rely on the proposition that the United States  
6 had notice of potential claims based on LMK's death when the administrative claim was  
7 filed. Mr. King's position relies on out of circuit district court cases, and he fails to cite  
8 any binding authority on this issue. *See* Dkt. 41 at 10-12. Under Ninth Circuit law, the  
9 "claimant" must file an administrative claim and notice of an incident that may give rise  
10 to the Government's liability does not satisfy the prerequisites of the FTCA for all  
11 possible claimants. *See Cadwalder v. United States*, 45 F.3d 297, 300-302 (9th Cir.  
12 1995). Therefore, Mr. King's first and fourth reasons to excuse his failure are without  
13 merit.  
14

15 Mr. King's second reason is that RCW 4.24.010 "requires all parental claims to be  
16 joined in one action and towards that end requires inter-parental notification." Dkt. 41 at  
17 13. Even if Mr. King's interpretation of the statute is correct, the only claimant in this  
18 action is Ms. King as the personal representative of the estate of LMK and there is no  
19 parental claim to be joined. Therefore, Mr. King's argument is without merit.

20 Finally, Mr. King argues that "[if] Mr. King had been provided notice [of the  
21 probate proceeding] he would have sought legal counsel and pursued and perfected his  
22 claims." Dkt. 41 at 13. Mr. King has provided no authority to excuse his failure based on  
23 what he would have done. Therefore, Mr. King's argument is without merit and the  
24 Court grants the Government's motion to dismiss Mr. King's complaint for lack of  
25 jurisdiction.  
26  
27  
28

1 **III. ORDER**

2 Therefore, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Government's motion to dismiss Mr.  
3 King's complaint (Dkt. 40) is **GRANTED** and Mr. King's claims against the Government  
4 are **DISMISSED**.

5 DATED this 28th day of February, 2012.

6   
7

8 BENJAMIN H. SETTLE  
9 United States District Judge  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28